

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-39 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance based on the below comments are respectfully requested.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-39 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting in view of Claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,756,955. In response, Applicants hereby submit a Terminal Disclaimer for Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-39. Accordingly, withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowable Claims

With the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-8, 12, 14, 16-23, 25-29, 32 and 34-39 are now in condition for allowance. Neither of the above claims have been substantively rejected and therefore should be deemed allowable.

Prior Art Rejection

The Office Action rejects Claims 10-11, 24, 32, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sakashita (US 6,661,400). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 10, 24 and 33

Each of Claims 10, 24 and 33 include the features of delaying first converted image data for the interval corresponding to one frame and outputting a second converted image data corresponding to a previous frame; generating compensation data for adjusting gray-scale values of the present frame according to the first converted image data and the second converted image data and generating the image data according to input image data and the compensation image data. Applicants respectfully submit that Sakashita fails to teach these features.

Sakashita teaches a system for improving the hysteresis of a liquid crystal panel by utilizing peak level dependency and two different time dependencies. This is accomplished by using the black level and the white level. See Column 4, lines 15-17 and 42-43. As stated in

Column 4, Sakashita compares the output of the encoder 2, which is alleged to be the Applicants claimed first converted data, with a delayed output of the arithmetic units 205. The frame memory 206, which is alleged to correspond to Applicants claimed delay unit, delays the arithmetic unit by one frame. Thus, Sakashita's system delays the arithmetic process data obtained from the first converted data but does not delay the first converted data. Further, as discussed at Column 4 and in Column 5, this is done for the black and the white levels only and not the gray level.

Thus, in Sakashita, a comparison is made between the first converted data and the delayed process data of a previous frame for the black level peak data or white level peak data. Sakashita does not teach delaying the first converted image data for an interval corresponding to one frame and outputting a second converted image data corresponding to a previous frame and generating a compensation data for adjusting the gray-scale values of the present frame according to the first converted image data and the second converted image data, as in the embodiments recited in Claims 10, 24 and 33.

Therefore, for the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Sakashita fails to teach each and every feature of independent Claims 10, 24 and 33. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection with respect to these claims and their dependent claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 30 and 31

In each of Claims 30 and 31 an image data processor for adjusting transmissivity values of a liquid crystal is claimed. The image data process uses an encoded image data that includes data that changes a transmissivity corresponding to a frame prior to the present frame to a transmissivity corresponding to the present frame within substantially one frame interval. Applicants respectfully submit that this feature of Claims 30 and 31 is not taught by Sakashita.

In Sakashita, the focus is to obtain the peak level values of the black level and white level. Applicants respectfully submit that Sakashita does not teach or suggest utilizing data that includes a change of transmissivity corresponding to a frame prior to the present frame to a transmissivity corresponding to the present frame within substantially one frame interval.

Applicants find nowhere in Sakashita where the data related to the transmissivity is utilized in the arithmetic calculation and the determination of the peak levels. In fact the Office Action only refers to FIG. 3A and FIG. 3B for teaching these features. Applicants find nowhere in FIG. 3A or FIG. 3B where the above claimed features referring to the transmissivity levels recited in independent Claims 30 and 31 is taught.

Therefore, in view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Sakashita fails to teach each and every feature of independent Claims 30 and 31 as required. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-39 are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies

Application No. 10/760,461
Amendment dated February 26, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2006

Docket No.: 1190-0581P

to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Chad J. Billings

Registration No.: 48,917

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant